

REMARKS

In a Final Office Action mailed on July 31, 2008, claims 39, 41-43, 45-47, 49 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Claus in view of England.

To make a determination under 35 U.S.C. § 103, several basic factual inquiries must be performed, including determining the scope and content of the prior art, and ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17, 148 U.S.P.Q. 459 (1965). Moreover, as the U.S. Supreme Court held, it is important to identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine reference teachings in the manner that the claimed invention does. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741, 82 U.S.P.Q.2d 1385 (2007).

Independent claims 39, 43 and 47 have been changed to more positively recite certain aspects of the invention. Because this change does not require further consideration and/or search, entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

As amended, the method of independent claim 39 recites receiving an unsolicited request from a first computer system for a second computer system to provide an identification of the second computer system. The method includes in response to the request, providing a visual interface on the second computer system to notify both a user of the second computer system of the request and prompt the user to allow or deny the request. Thus, a particular advantage of the claimed invention is that a rogue website, for example, is prevented from secretly obtaining an identification of the user's computer system. Such identification may be used for such improper purposes as unauthorized tracking of the user's activity on the Internet.

Contrary to the claimed invention, Claus discloses a security system that includes a user smart card, which the user inserts into a reader and enters the user's identification number for purposes of gaining access to a host computer system. However, the user is cognizant of the security request, as Claus is directed to an entirely different purpose than the claimed invention. As such, one of skill in the art in possession of Claus and England would not have combined these references as the claimed invention does to derive the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of amended independent claim 39.

For similar reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of amended independent claims 43 and 47. In this regard, the article of independent claim 43 includes a storage medium that stores instructions to cause a processor of a first processor-based system to provide a visual

interface on a second computer system to notify both a user of the second computer of an unsolicited identification request and prompt a user to allow or deny the request; and the system of independent claim 47 includes a first computer that is coupled to a database to, in response to an unsolicited request for the first computer to provide an identification of the first computer, provide a visual interface on the first computer to notify both a user of the first computer of the request and prompt the user to allow or deny the request.


Dependent claims 40-42, 44-46 and 48-50 are patentable for at least the same reasons as the claims from which they depend.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant requests withdrawal of the § 103 rejections and a favorable action in the form a Notice of Allowance. The Commissioner is authorized to pay any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0160US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 30, 2008



Fred G. Pruner, Jr., Reg. No. 40,778  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
1616 S. Voss Road, Suite 750  
Houston, TX 77057  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorney for Intel Corporation